

Weekly OCII and SFDPH Conference Call Talking Points

12:15 pm-1:00 pm, Telephone

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

June 6, 2021 | Internal Use Only

<u>San Francisco Department of Public Health</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Amy Brownell, Hunters Point Lead- Patrick Fosdahl, Director Environmental Health	<u>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Kasheica McKinney, Hunters Point Project Manager
--	---

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for July 12.

What's the July Transfers meeting schedule now that the BCT is pushed into that time on July 15?

Today's Participants – Yolanda, Patrick, Amy, Kasheica

Communications/Meetings

- **Media:**

- No new media on the site
- On June 17, the City will host a ribbon-cutting ceremony for the India Basin Waterfront project.

- **Community events/interest:**

- **Parcel A Fact Sheet** – Where is OCII in the review of the Chinese translation? OCII is moving forward with reviewing this translation.
- **Env & Reuse Subcommittee of HPS CAC** – Greenaction attended the May 24 Subcommittee meeting of the HPS CAC and asked many questions. No additional feedback. There is an upcoming HPS CAC meeting on June 14 where OCII will be providing information on the elective radiological testing on Block 56 (affordable housing site).
- **Navy's meeting with the SF Shipyard residents' group last month** – Any news from Supervisor Walton's office on this meeting? Nothing from the Supervisor Walton's office. Little confusion on the Navy's report out about different ways to reach community members. Kasheica mentioned the HPS CAC is an excellent forum to reach out to the rest of the community.
- **EPA meeting with members of the public.** Last week, EPA headquarters accepted a meeting with Dr. Sumchai and seven other members of the public. Of the seven, three participated in the meeting: Dr. S, Bradley Angel, and Arianne Harrison. They raised concerns about people being exposed to site-related contamination, based on the results of the urine-screening data and discussed why there should be a public health emergency issued for this community. Concerns were also raised about site access/security and sea level rise leading to remedy failure for the engineered cap on Parcel E-2.
- **Urine Screening:** Any hope on the Navy addressing this? Dr. S also started a "Go Fund Me" campaign to raise money for more urine screening work.
- **EPA/Navy letters community involvement:** In November, the Navy committed to doing an evaluation of its community outreach and involvement program, starting in March. We recently asked the Navy for an update and they said they would have a contract in place in May. Then, we recently heard from the Navy they were doing a CIP update that would include this evaluation.

Internal Use Only - Deliberative

- **SF Shipyard Artists held a “press conference” in May.** The artist voiced dissatisfaction on Five-Point’s approach. The Artists are suggesting the dirt piles, with tackifier, and fencing are a visual nuisance and should be removed. Even though the construction has been placed on hold, they would like the developer to address the nuisance. When there have been dust complaints in the past, SFDPH responds (visual inspection and conversation). The artists sent an email to Five-Point and its likely Five-Point may provide a more formal complaint or receive any response.
- ***Never Surrender: The Fight for EJ in BVHP:*** There will be another showing of the documentary on March 16. Any feedback from the community? The showing will include a panel, and BVHP’s Michele Pierce is part of the panel.
- **IVAN complaints on dust at HPNS:** In February, someone (we believe Dr. Sunchai) issued three complaints within IVAN related to HPNS. We all saw the video shared at the Feb HPS CAC meeting. Recently, BVHP IVAN folks reached out to the Navy for a response to the complaint. Derek provided a very limited response. Bradley immediately sent an email to EPA Superfund asking about dust-moving activities at the site.
- **Title VI complaint against SFDPH and BAAQMD on dust issues at Parcel A –** The complaint against SFDPH has been dismissed; the complaint against BAAQMD has been accepted for further investigation. EPA reached out to BAAQMD and asked them to enter into an informal resolution. BAAQMD declined, noting it is already implementing many of the requests in the informal resolution and is already requiring air monitoring for asbestos near the Parcel A construction work. **In a couple weeks, EPA will be issuing a “preliminary findings” to this complaint.** We understand the developer is carrying out the ADMP + dust control plan, which has sampling for asbestos and particulate matter and this sampling has been ongoing. However, EPA air monitoring experts have wondered if it is time to update this sampling plan.
- **BVHP Family Histories Study –** Amy called the number to get a copy of the flyer.
- **Congressional interest: None.**
- **FOIA:** Our site attorneys are working on two new FOIAs from Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER). The first is on the submarine piers and marine pins background numbers, and it appears the Navy also received a request. The second one is on the RGs for buildings.
- **SF Supervisors:** We will probably reach out to Supervisor Walton later this month when we are ready to respond to the Navy’s latest RESRAD runs.

OCII team – Mayor Breed has appointed Sally Oerth as the Interim Executive Director of OCII. Sally has a wealth of experience at OCII. There will likely be a national recruitment process for this mayoral appointed position.

Health & Safety Scans onsite – The Navy has mobilized on this work and will complete it soon. Will the City ask for a map that shows the white-space scanning plus rework areas (as discussed last month)? Amy will push when the work is done.

IR10 Building Letter from EPA: Last month, the Navy requested an extension to the RAWP and Karen responded with a letter expressing concern about plans to take away the SVE system near Building 123. Amy has asked EPA to retract the letter “to remove the assertions from the public record since the RAWP document hasn’t been issued so there isn’t any basis for the assertions.” From the public

Internal Use Only - Deliberative

perception issue, there are concerns raised on something that hasn't happened yet (premature). The Navy is doing a different remediation to dig up areas of soil contamination.

- What do you mean by the "public record"? via a FOIA or information request.
- Perhaps a conversation is a better approach.

Parcel G Building RGs Long-term Protectiveness Evaluation: In March, Enrique, Laura, Grant, and Anthony met to discuss the ongoing informal dispute between the Navy and EPA on the radiological remediation goals for buildings. After the meeting, we had been expecting a Navy proposal to conduct a more sensitive radiological scan of one or more Hunters Point buildings. In April, the Navy changed course and provided EPA with RESRAD runs with modified inputs and assumptions from its 2019 deliverable. (So, they are attempting to evaluate the radiological remediation goals for the buildings.) This deliverable seems to attempt to address the concerns EPA raised in our August 2020, letter.

- We are evaluating this information and continue to meet with the Navy's technical team. We are optimistic about the information we are learning. Although, there is some work left to do.
- In March, there had been discussion on concerns about using onsite buildings to establish background reference building. The Navy expressed an openness to use an offsite building that would be of similar vintage (1940s-50s) with similar building materials (sheet rock, wood, metals, etc.).
- Does this "field testing study" (suggesting in March) need to be complete before scanning begins or simultaneously? Navy might be interested in doing this simultaneously. Will this be a 3-6 month push-out? What are they trying to study during that time? How long would the building testing take? We have heard estimates as short as 6 months, but the public schedule had longer times.
- In April, we discussed whether demolishing the buildings prior to transfer should be a discussion at an upcoming Transfers meeting. In our back-and-forth emails with the Navy over the following three months, the Navy noted it would cost \$300 million to demolish the buildings. A long time ago, there were discussions about the developer demolishing the buildings prior to transfer; however, it is a different environment now? Should this be a topic of discussion at the Transfers meeting (June)?
- We continue to encourage the Navy to send the requested information to substantiate the claims of background levels and technical impracticability of implementing the numbers EPA shared in August. The Navy shared some information, which we find deficient to answer these important questions.
- We haven't seen an example of the use of RESRAD for potentially radiologically-contaminated buildings to be determined appropriate for residential use. We really need to ensure the tools properly model exposure pathways for a child in a residential yard. Last month, Kasheica mentioned the developers asking how the conversation is moving forward.
- Recently, we received additional question from Dan Hirsch on our letter to the Navy on RESRAD and BPRG (August 2020). It's important that EPA is being asked to defend the Navy's approach, so it's important to be prepared to respond to these questions.

Parcel G radiological retesting soil fieldwork: The Navy has finally resumes the fieldwork, and EPA has begun our field oversight and split sampling, alongside the state.

- **Strontium 90.** The sampling results from Parcel G are presenting Strontium-90.

Internal Use Only - Deliberative

- Based on the background study, we didn't expect to see strontium-90 detections. (For example, there were no detections of strontium-90 in over 200 background samples.)
 - Strontium-90 is presenting in 10% of the sampling results. (Remember the Navy is only analyzing 10% of the total samples for strontium-90 and a few other radionuclides.)
 - However, there have been a couple of recent unvalidated samples that appear to be around the cleanup goals for a radionuclide called strontium-90. We are working with the Navy to better understand those samples and how this may impact the next steps of the soil retesting work.
 - The bottom-line question is whether these results will trigger 100% excavation of the soil in Phase 2.
 - The next step is something in writing from the Navy. Phase 2 is scheduled to start in November.
-
- Communicating schedule of radiological retesting to the public. Parcel G retesting work will not start until later this month. We are curious how this may impact the overall schedule. In January, we asked the Navy to provide a consistent mechanism for updates to the public on the schedule. Any thoughts?
 - The memorandum-to-the-file is final, although the Navy hasn't been too clear on how this document will be publicly accessible.
 - We continue to pay close attention to the Navy's implementation of its dust management and air monitoring plan. Although we have raised concerns on how the Navy is publicly sharing the data and urged the Navy to get appropriate meteorological equipment. Since September we continue to ask the Navy to obtain professional meteorological equipment (or stop the practice of subtracting upwind measurements). We have also pointed out where they are subtracting upwind measurements on low wind speed days, which is not the appropriate implementation of the Work Plan. In November, some of the air data numbers for short periods of time exceeded the 24-hour protective limits. We recently received this data and are looking into this.

Parcel D-1 Post-ROD change and LUCRD: Earlier this year, the Navy agreed this post-ROD change for Parcel D-1 will be a ROD Amendment. This will create a public participation process, and we are unclear on the timing and the plan of this. What are the city's thoughts on the public participation process of this ROD Amendment?

Parcel E and Asbestos-containing material (ACM): In late 2020, the Navy shared it had stopped work at Parcel E, because of suspected ACM. They are continuing to analyze the situation and we expect an update soon. Amy would like to be included on a future meeting, if scheduled.